DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 757 JC 730 064

TITLE	The Two-Year College Trustee: National Issues and Perspectives.
INSTITUTION	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 72
NOTE	40p.; A special report
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (Single copies to trustees and executive officers, free; others, $1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College Administration; Community Colleges; Community Control; *Governance; Junior Colleges; Post Secondary Education; Private Colleges; *Publications; Speeches; Statewide Planning; Surveys; *Trustees

ABSTRACT

This booklet, intended for junior and community college trustees, contains three addresses given this year at a special conference for two-year college trustees, a paper based on a national survey of community college trustees, reaction to that paper, and a selected bibliography of articles, studies, and dissertations by lay governance of the two-year college sector. The addresses are: (1) "Who Decides?" by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., which stresses that the locus of decision making and power--historically found in the board of trustees and the president--may shift to administrative levels far removed from college and community; (2) "Statewide Planning and Local Autonomy" by James L. Wattenbarger, which reaffirms the trend toward State level coordination and control and proposes guidelines for differentiating State from local responsibilities; and (3) "The Private College in the 70's" by Wesley M. Westerberg, which focuses on important issues that confront the private two-year colleges and on specific contributions toward meeting the issues. (Author/KM)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 073757

THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRUSTEE:

National Issues and Perspectives

A special report of

The Association of Governing Boards
of Universities and Colleges

December 1972

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

☐ Who Decides?
Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.

☐ Statewide Planning and Local Autonomy
James L. Wattenbarger

☐ The Private College in the 70's
Wesley M. Westerberg

■ Community College Trustees: A Survey
Peter K. Mills

☐ Commentary on the Survey
S. V. Martorana

☐ Current Bibliography

JC 730 064

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 02 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

This publication for junior and community college trustees is the first in what AGB hopes can be a series of reports to provide its various constituencies with timely and helpful material. It contains three addresses given this year at a special conference for two-year college trustees; a paper based on a national research study conducted by a community college dean; reaction to that paper by an acknowledged veteran in the two-year college field; and a selected bibliography of articles, studies and dissertations on lay governance of the two-year college sector.

AGB acknowledges the support of the Lilly Endowment and its expression of interest in the Association of Governing Boards for making this publication possible.

Single copies free to trustees and chief executive officers; others, including quantity orders, at $1.00 per copy.

Introduction

About a year ago representatives from the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, the National Council of Independent Junior Colleges, and the Maryland State Board for Community Colleges met to discuss the feasibility of a conference for the two-year college trustees in the mid-Atlantic region. Thereafter, a larger group was assembled to ascertain the degree of interest in developing such a conference. Those attending were:

Sister Majella Berg, President
Marymount College of Virginia

Terry Devaney, Trustee
Prince George's Community College

Douglas F. Libby, President
Delaware County Community College

S. V. Martorana, (then) Vice
Chancellor for Two-Year Colleges
State University of New York

Peter D. Pelham, President
Mt. Vernon College

Patricia Perkinson, Administrative
Assistant to the Chancellor
Virginia Community College
System

Frank B. Pesci, Associate Professor
of Higher Education, Catholic
University of America

Kenneth Wright, Director
Community College Program
New Jersey Department of
Higher Education

Due in large measure to the interest and support of each of these people, it was decided that a conference should be scheduled in May, 1972.

A program committee was formed, consisting of:

Walter A. Graham, (then) Director
National Council of Independent
Junior Colleges

Richard T. Ingram, Program
Associate, Association of
Governing Boards

Alfred C. O'Connell, Executive
Director, Maryland State Board
for Community Colleges

Frank B. Pesci, Associate Professor
of Higher Education, Catholic
University of America

An unusually fine group of speakers were brought together in Baltimore, Maryland on May 11-12, 1972 for the first conference of its kind in the mid-Atlantic region. They were asked to address themselves to some of the national issues that are

foremost among the concerns of community and junior college trustees and presidents. Addresses of three of these speakers are included in this publication: Edmund J. Gleazer, President, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges; James L. Wattenbarger, Director of the Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida; and Wesley M. Westerberg, Chancellor of Kendall College.

In addition to those whose papers are included here, the more than 130 persons in attendance at the conference were privileged to hear also from Joseph P. Cosand, Deputy Commissioner for Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education, and former President, St. Louis Junior College District; Robert L. Stuhr, partner in the firm of Gonser, Gerber, Tinker and Stuhr; Robert Gray, New York attorney and an expert in collective bargaining; and Frederic W. Ness, President, Association of American Colleges. Highlights from their presentations are summarized on pages 26-27.

As an adjunct to the formal side of the conference, trustees from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia were given the opportunity to meet separately to discuss current and pending state legislation affecting their institutions.

Information in the recent national survey by Peter K. Mills, included as a supplement to the conference papers, adds significantly to the current literature for this segment of American higher education. Dr. S. V. Martorana was invited to comment on the report because of his recognized experience in the two-year college field.

Who Decides?

Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.

Dr. Gleazer stresses that the locus of decision making and power – historically found in the board of trustees and the president – may shift to administrative levels far removed from college and community.

Who decides? Who calls the shots? Who will determine what students should be served by community colleges, how many students there can be, how much tuition they will pay? Who will determine the educational programs and learning strategies utilized? Who will establish teaching load and salaries? Who will determine the buildings to be constructed, their architectural style and their location?

In his autobiography Lincoln Steffens describes a technique he developed for getting at the people who make decisions:

> I went to the newspaper offices, one by one, all of them, and I hit upon an approach which I have since used on all subjects – business, politics, reform . . . . The question I framed for the newspaper offices . . . was directed to find the boss of the paper. Calling with my card at the editorial office, I would ask the office boy: "Say, kid, who is 'it' here?"
>
> "Why," he would answer, "Mr. So-and-so is the editor."
>
> "No, no," I protested, "I don't mean the front, I mean really."
>
> "Oh, you mean the owner, that's Mr. Blank."
>
> Feigning disgust and disappointment, I would say, "The owner, he's only the rear as the editor is the front. What I mean is, who's running the shebang? Who knows what's what and – who decides?"
>
> "Oh," he would exclaim – whether he was the office boy, a reporter or an

Edmund J. Gleazer is President of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. This paper, presented at the AGB Conference in May, 1972, is taken from his new book, *Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges*, and is reprinted through special arrangement with the publisher, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York City. © 1972 by McGraw-Hill, Inc.

editorial writer – his face lighting up with the intelligence faces habitually conceal – "Oh, the man you are looking for is – Nut Brown."[1]

The locus of decision making is the locus of power, the capacity to determine what will be done. Historically, boards of trustees, locally elected, joined with the president of the college to resolve such matters. A look into the future, however, reveals a far more complex picture with a possible shift of power to administrative levels far removed from college and community.

There are many who would be party to institutional decision making. Among these are students, faculty, administration, local boards representing the community, state-level community college boards and similar agencies, coordinating boards for higher education, the legislature, and the governor's office. What is the forecast of their relative influence on the policy directions of the college?

Probably more of the decisions affecting the goals and priorities of community colleges will be made in the state capitols. The state legislature, the governor's office, and state agencies will play an increasing part in shaping the future of these community-oriented institutions. The move toward greater state-level power comes at the same time as a rising demand at the local level for the college to be more quickly responsive to community needs as well as to broaden opportunities for participation by faculty, students, and community representatives in goal setting and program development. The result is tension and struggle for decision making authority among parties on the local scene and between those on local and state levels. Dominant among the state-level forces, in the eyes of most interviewees, will be the state legislature which shows not only increased interest in educational matters but a new consciousness of its own role and responsibilities.

For whatever reason the costs of education, unrest on the college campus, the rise of collective bargaining – state legislatures are demonstrating a keen interest in education from pre-school through the university. Moreover, there are changes coming about in the legislatures themselves that have further implications for education and other state services.

Community colleges are not going to be left alone. Budgets are too big for that and generally they become a matter of more than local concern. As enrollments rise and costs go up, the search for funds leads increasingly to the state level. The state wants to know what it is getting for its money. The legislature has little desire to deal with dozens of community colleges. It will look to a state agency as its

[1]Lincoln Steffens, *The Autobiography of Lincoln Steffens*, p. 402, Harcourt, Brace & Company, Inc., New York: 1931.

point of contact. The quality of that agency will be of critical importance in maintaining a constructive tension between local and state forces. State-level leadership is required which has high respect for the capacity of the local institution to identify and respond to community needs, a leadership which exercises its authority more through persuasion than through regulation and seeks full discussion and involvement by those who will be affected by policy determinations.

The profession of state-level community college administration is relatively new; with a few notable exceptions, it is a product of the past ten years or less. With a shift in locus of power toward the state and with the consequent tensions already referred to between local institutions and the state, plus the often competing interests commonly found in state capitols, expertise of the highest order is needed for difficult and complex administrative tasks.

Board Power

I listened to members of a community college board discuss the future of their institution. The way they were talking, I told them, one would assume that they felt they would have a great deal to say about the direction in which the college would move. "You are damn right," they responded. "We don't need people in the state capitol or in Washington telling us what to do." "It is a bunch of egotists like this that contribute toward the inability of this state to come up with a master plan for higher education," the chairman of the board declared. "It is great to have more financial support without surrendering your power. But, can it really be done?"

Are boards surrendering their power? Developments in state capitols may indeed hold implications for future board policy determinations. What I see happening though, even in the face of possible limitation of power, is more active exercise of board authority than previously has been the case. The threefold adage about the president—that the board is to hire the president, support him as it can, then fire him — which at one time allegedly described the major role of the board, will not hold true.

Reports of student dissent and protest, whether at the local institution or not, plus community concerns about the tax dollar, have resulted in mounting pressures on local board members. Constituents are asking questions. They want answers from the board. People who in former times may have enjoyed the honorific aspects of board membership are compelled now, in their own defense, to have up-to-date, comprehensive knowledge about the institution and its programs. Another reason for stepped-up board interest and participation is the number of educational matters now adjudicated in the courts. The board, as the legal entity for the institution, is involved whether it wants to be or not.

Actually, the community college board member is a relative newcomer to a field of activity long occupied by public school boards of education and the regents and trustees of the college and university world. Not until 1967 did the community colleges in the state of Washington have separate boards, distinct from high school district boards of education. And in Illinois the process toward community college boards was given impetus under the Higher Education Act of 1965. Until 1969, Florida institutions were under county boards of education with community college advisory councils. In Maryland, county boards of education had jurisdiction until recently. The same thing would hold true for other large sections of the country. So, in fact, the identity of the community college board member has been established in a number of states not much more than five years ago. Add the fact that 200 to 300 new institutions have been established during that same period of time, and the result is several hundred new trustees seeking to determine the suitable role of the community college board as well as their responsibilities as members.

At the same time, another new entity, the state-level community college board, was created in several states: California, Arizona, Illinois, Washington, and Maryland, to name only some. Now there is a problem of sorting out respective responsibilities and authority between state and local levels. There will be more state-level boards, for reasons given previously. Local boards are apprehensive that this may mean decreasing community orientation and the capacity to respond easily and quickly to local needs. Where local boards exist, often there is a strong sense of community loyalty and faith in the merits of localism.

In seventeen of the twenty states included in field visits, the pattern of local boards existed. However in Tennessee, Massachusetts, and in Virginia there are no local boards, or they are used in advisory capacities only. Where administration is predominantly under a state-level board there are recurrent calls at the local level for a means by which the different needs of community college areas can be recognized. Constituents ask for a mechanism by which the state board can be held accountable to each community college area as well as to the state as a whole.

One matter at issue is the process by which board membership is determined. In places where board members are appointed, that arrangement seems to be favored, although a question long debated but not answered is how to keep politics out of the appointments. In one state where the governor appoints, his designees are ostensibly recommended by the senator from that area sometimes with support of a local political committee. People in the community, it is reported, frequently wonder what the "payoff" is for. Not much respect is

noted in the college community toward the board. One of the governor's choices indicated that he was not looked to by the community as someone to participate with others in developing policy but rather as a "prod" to get things done. If a student who flunked out of the university wanted to get into the college, the board member was called upon by the parents to put in a good word for their son. In his position, people in the area gave little thought to the policy making responsibilities of the board but suggested to others, "If you have a problem with the college, call up that guy Fisher and he will fix things up for you."

The president of this college reported direct contacts by board members with college administrators and faculty in order to have favors done. Interviewees reported a tendency for the board to "get involved in every detail." Are the characteristics of this board a function of the system by which members are selected or are there environmental factors to consider? The director of the community action program for the area described political action in that county as "very direct and sometimes very messy." He did not think you could eliminate politics. His advice: "You can't afford to have vested interests in your job as college president. You make the decisions you think are best and then you get grabbed by the political arm. You need to have other expertise so that you will have something else to go to."

In another state, three board members are appointed by the governor and six by the county commissioners. The rationale given for gubernatorial appointments has to do with the state's share of financial aid to the institution. The board chairman in this case favors the appointive approach and believes there is a difference between elected and appointed trustees. "If you are elected you have some sense of obligation to those who elect you and you are probably more aggressive with regard to your stance toward administration."

A leading industrialist commented on the makeup of that board: "In the beginning they seemed to be quite ordinary people. They had not been greatly active in city affairs but they turned out to be superb and dedicated to their tasks."

We felt that the appointments had been good and he would favor this kind of appointment, by a local body (county commissioners) rather than appointment by the governor or popular election.

And in still another state, a board member appointed by the governor saw the governor as being too far away from the local situation. He wondered if at least one of the five board members could be selected by local people. At the present he feels that the local people "have no say." He added the comment that a Republican governor seems to select Republicans as board members,

which certainly isn't surprising in this era of political influence and power.

In several states where the common practice is for board members to be locally selected, governors are revealing a new interest in making appointments of at least part of the board based upon the larger share of the financial load carried by the state. In those states where costs are met by state, local district, and students, the question is bound to come up whether this line of reasoning would lead toward student representation on the board.

To anyone taking a national look, board behavior shows remarkable variety. This may be a phenomenon of the particular political modes of state or region. One element of difference is the degree to which authority is delegated to administration. Faculty members in an eastern college said that they could not understand why seven political appointees to a board that meets five hours per month need, apparently, to make all the decisions. The president, they said, must have authority delegated to him. They reported additionally that during the past two years there had been almost 100 percent turnover in the board. They were concerned because they had a salary package coming up for consideration which represented a great deal of work on their part. And a new board member, one who had not attended any previous sessions, was to be at the meeting. The faculty were of the opinion that he knew nothing about the college and its program but he might cast the deciding vote. There must be a better way, they said, of selecting board members and relating the board to faculty and administration.

I sat in on a board meeting in the South. There were no students, faculty, or community representatives present, just the president, a few administrators, and a newspaper reporter. Among brief presentations made to the board was a college "master plan" required by a state-level agency. The president asked an administrative assistant to make the presentation. Posted on the wall were a number of drawings to show placement of proposed buildings. No questions were asked about program planning which might have led to the determination of the facilities or their placement. The college gets "points" toward possible federal grants if there is a master plan approved by the board. Among the facilities described were a new administration building, a gymnasium, wings on the technical building, and parking lots.

At the close of the presentation the president commented: "In addition we will need to provide some program material and a little later on some examples of how we are serving the disadvantaged." One board member asked, "Do you have an estimate of the number of students we can handle with those facilities?" The president responded, "Well, we haven't got that yet, and

of course this plan can be changed as we get closer to doing some of the buildings. Also, it will make quite a difference if we can get the youngsters to come in the afternoon. Now all of them want to come in the morning."

A motion was made to accept the presentation as a master plan for the college. Elapsed time: fifteen minutes. Obviously, board members in these two institutions did not have the same views about delegation of authority to the president or policy responsibility of the board.

Who speaks for the college – the board or the president? is a related question. In one state, board members from two institutions who were elected by their constituents likened elected board members to the office of United States senator. The president of the college, they stated, has a role similar to that of the administrative assistant to the senator. As they see it, the community college president is to the locally elected board as the administrative assistant is to the senator. And who really speaks for the institution? Is it the senator or the administrative assistant? Is it the board member or the president? It is the board member, they would say, for it is their view that they operate under a mandate from the citizens who elect them.

But in a community college located in a large city in another state, the chairman of the board said the institution needs a strong president. He needs to be looked to as a leader. He did not for a moment agree with the definition of the respective roles of trustee and president described above.

Board members need understanding of what goes on, and it seems that there are so many high-priority crises. Just as you are about to get to some kind of an evaluative look, another crisis changes the priorities. Curriculum, for example, does not get to the board. By the time we hear about it, all the processing has taken place, and it is just presented for adoption. Answers that we request seem to get lost in the computers. So we really don't quite know the score.

He was not expressing bitterness, but almost wistfully seemed to be saying, "We would like to know a little more about some of the really important matters, and one of these is program, and another is students. Yet we spend most of our time on buildings and crises."

The call for more board time on institutional purposes, goals, and evaluation of policies was sounded in a number of places.

One trustee commented: Five years ago we had kind of a "ho hum" board but now people have found that one of the ways to get things done is by being militant, and this is the kind of approach they make to the board. Without this kind of pressure, unfortunately, the board would probably not have gone as far as it has gone in responding to needs.

Other comments were in a similar vein:

Waves of community concerns and feelings wash over and through the college.

Constituents call you up and want to know what is going on; you have to find out. You had better know.

In former days the board would appoint the president and keep hands off, but no longer. We need to know what is working and what is not working.

Frequent reference was made to the "review and evaluation" function of the board. After a board approves policy recommended by the president, they want to know what the effect has been of the policy adopted.

A trustee in a paper on "board power" described the "fascinating anomaly" of a group with almost absolute authority and responsibility de jure, which has almost no authority de facto. He maintains that

the legally vested power is greatly restricted by (1) a dependence upon administrative and faculty expertise which results in boards ratifying the decisions of others; (2) a lack of basic inside information about the operation and ideological direction of the institution; (3) a tradition of delegation of authority for administrative and curricular decisions which determine the basic character of the institution.

Much of the current faculty, administrative, and student attack upon governing boards has its seeds in the board attempt to recapture authority over college affairs commensurate with the legally established responsibility imposed upon the board.

He proposes that if the board is to effectively exercise its power as a legislative body developing policy and evaluating college practice, it must be properly staffed. He further maintains that a board member should consider it his responsibility to criticize judgments on "educational matters" which do not jibe with his view of the social obligations inherent in the community college.

To even suggest that the board have its own staff for review and evaluation and not rely entirely upon the president's staff is so contrary to administrative mores that a former president trembles to see the words appear on paper. Nevertheless, evidence is substantial that the legal responsibilities placed upon those boards of trustees which function in an environment of rapid, sometimes revolutionary, change, will require them to be more involved in the conduct of the institutions than generally has been true in the past. The press for tax dollars and consequent demand for more accountability by institutions to the funding sources further commits trustees to a knowledge of goals and performance that cannot be achieved by simply reading college brochures, the president's annual report or even the usual college budget. But the need is not for boards to do the president's work, but rather to insist upon the exercise of its own full legislative authority with the support of an executive who is equally clear as to his role.

Board members should be prepared to deal with change. So that when change is forced, it is probed

for its possible values rather than dealt with as a threat. A board needs to develop a sense of the past and the future and the capacity to perceive issues in a conceptual framework so that they are dealt with other than on an incremental basis, from crisis to crisis. They need to understand the frustration of community groups who find it impossible to deal with the Pentagon or even state colleges and universities because of the insulation of layers of administration and control, but who exert their power to get things done at the local level because the community college board is there. The local board fulfills a principle long honored that government should be as close as possible to the place where action is taking place. In many parts of this country change will be demanded. Will the board use change creatively and constructively to come up with wise policy?

Faculty Power

Looking to the future, I found general agreement not only that the faculty of community colleges should be more involved in those decisions that affect them and their work but that such participation was likely to occur. The nature of that participation is of crucial importance in fulfilling college purposes. For the faculty member is in direct contact with the student, who is the focus of all efforts of the college. Plans, programs, and administrative structures all have their ultimate expression in student-teacher interaction. Will the organized power of faculty, which is taking a variety of forms throughout the nation, be utilized predominantly to make secure the place of the faculty member within the institution? Or will it have broader reach toward institutional goals? If the latter, it will not be enough to develop a deeper understanding of respective roles of faculty, board, and administration, nor to achieve greater skills in relationships. Beyond these, new patterns of organization may be required which are more suitable to the ends specified above.

Student Power

To what extent will students call the shots in community colleges? The answer will vary according to the social and political makeup of the area which the college serves. In view of the goals sought by community college students as well as their other characteristics, I think it unlikely that they will seek to "run" the institution. It is true that they possess an ultimate "weapon" in that they can decide whether to enter the college or not and for what kinds of programs they will sign up. However, this element of choice may be limited if society continues to demand postsecondary training as a qualification for employment and if alternative educational or training opportunities are not readily available. Most important, though, is a basic question of whether the community college is viewed as an institution designed to process academic products, or of

whether an important goal of the college is involvement of faculty, administrators, and students in a learning process not limited to the classroom which encourages participation, interaction, and shared responsibility. If the latter is the case, then goals of learning such as self-management, ability to relate effectively to others, capacity to exercise initiative and to assume social responsibilities can be realized by exploiting the learning opportunities implicit in the total operation of the college. And not insignificant is the residual benefit from sharing in appropriate discussion with other participants in policy making: commitment to implementation of ultimate decisions.

A community college seeking to carry out a program of this kind faces numerous obstacles. Among these are the great range of ages, broad spectrum of educational and vocational interests, differences in motivations, and a commuting student and faculty population, as well as the factor of student transiency. If students are to be more involved in institutional decision-making, administrators and board members will need to encourage that process. Contravening forces are better organized to condition the directions of the college and hence possess more relative power. No great change is expected with regard to "student power" in the community college unless deliberate measures are adopted by the college to encourage that development.

Summary

A great deal has yet to be determined in the nation's community colleges on who will make the decisions about who enrolls, who teaches, who pays, and who governs. The makeup of the curriculum, the extent of the services to the community, the number and locations of colleges – these are questions that must be decided every week, questions which shape the institution. The decisions are being made. But the number of persons involved in the decision making is getting larger and the proper role for each participant is still being defined.

The picture varies from state to state and from college to college. But the trend is for increased involvement by state-level officials, most notably the governors and the legislators and agencies set up and acting under their mandates. The reason for this increased involvement is the mounting investment the states are being asked to make in community college education. State officials want to know, and must know, how state funds are being spent. Review of educational programs at this level can be advantageous. The kind of coordination that prevents unnecessary duplication and promotes efficiency and cooperation within a state can benefit the institutions and the public. A key element here will be the development of a new kind of professional: the state-level admin-

istrator who understands community college education, the educational needs within his state, and the political process in which he works; and who possesses the abilities to facilitate sound growth and development.

On the campus there is more participation by trustees, faculty, and students in decision making. Who calls the shots in this milieu is certainly an open question. Changes in local decision-making structures are taking place because of new developments such as collective bargaining, growth of multicampus districts, and the increasing maturity of the student body. The end results of these forces and their effects on governance patterns remains to be seen.

There is an increased willingness on the part of the traditional policy makers, the presidents and the board members, to accept the idea that all groups affected by a decision should participate, to some degree, in the decision-making process. If for no other reason, this modus operandi is being adopted because it helps ensure that the decision will become operational after it has been made. This same pragmatism will no doubt govern in the period ahead as there is probing and testing to find appropriate roles and degrees of involvement for all the participants in decisions affecting community colleges and the persons they serve.

Statewide Planning and Local Autonomy

James L. Wattenbarger

Reaffirming the trend toward state level coordination and control, Dr. Wattenbarger acknowledges that there are a number of areas better handled at higher administrative levels. He proposes guidelines for differentiating state from local responsibilities.

Self-governance – autonomy – institutional integrity – traditional freedoms – these are terms which are used to describe a very special authority which institutions of higher education have held sacred over the many years of their existence. This authority has been written into the constitutions of several states and has come to be considered as a basic essential characteristic of higher education, especially at the university level. What is generally accepted at the university level is also coveted for all other institutions of higher education.

Events of modern times, however – both those with economic impellers and those with a more sociological origin – have been pushing constantly in the direction of state level coordination and often control. This is true of the community junior college development in particular, although there are indications of similar trends for elementary and high school as well as for the university and state college systems.

Briefly examining these influences have caused a re-examination of the control patterns used in operating institutions of higher education:

1. Changing patterns of financial support.

All levels of education have become dependent upon state sources and more recently upon federal sources for support. The local *ad valorem* tax has become a poor base

James L. Wattenbarger is Director of the Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida.

for taxation to support education. There is even a discernible trend toward eliminating this source (local taxation) of funds in some states.

2. Population mobility.

The movement of families from one home to another has become a major factor in American life. This makes universal minimum standards of educational quality a real concern to more and more people.

3. Trends toward centralization and consolidation.

The development of multi-county, inter-state, regional, and national approaches to solving specific problems are now prevalent in social and political life.

4. The recognition of the value of planning and coordination.

The results of planned growth and development in business and the recognition of the value of coordination in industry led many people to demand similar efficiency in tax-supported activities.

5. The reemphasis of state responsibility for education.

Each state constitution as it was originally written recognized state responsibility for education. This responsibility was in turn delegated to local units (school districts) in most cases. Of more recent date, however, the state has been forced to assume more responsibility for maintaining standards and has exerted more leadership and often more control. This trend has accompanied increased state financial support.

6. The recognition of the need for education.

Increasing demands for educated personnel at all levels of employment, studies of income as related to educational attainment, and similar recognition of the value of educational opportunity have caused legislators and civic leaders to demand that institutions serve their home area of a state. Faith in higher education has at times placed these institutions in positions of serving as a basic requirement for industrial development.

7. Federal support for education.

The increasing interest in higher education expressed directly through federal legislation and federal financial support has given particular emphasis to centralizing planning and coordination, and even approval, at the state level.

These trends merely indicate a number of related influences which in many states have affected the legislative decisions based on study recommendations.

As we look at the development of these educational institutions around the nation we note, however, that the rather independent local orientation which nurtured the early development is no longer *the* major characteristic of community junior colleges. There have been changes

operating in the newer developments of these institutions and even some changes in the older ones too. Several states very recently have established junior colleges which are completely state supported and state controlled. In states which in the past have demonstrated a strong belief in local orientation and institutional autonomy there has recently been a trend toward more statewide coordination and an attendant increase in state level responsibility.

There are three major types of state-level structures. The first is a structure in which there is a board which **governs junior colleges** at the state level. This is the state board for community colleges with an executive officer, sometimes referred to as a chancellor. Under his direct supervision are a number of institutions and in this kind of a state-level organization the board at the state level has direct operational control of the community colleges. It has specific control in these states over the establishment of new colleges, over the evaluation of those colleges, over developing and approving budgets, over allocating state funds, and for developing master plans. The board serves as a spokesman to the legislature, and makes all of the day-to-day decisions.

The second type of state board is that responsible for **governing and coordinating** the community colleges. This is differentiated from the governing board in that there are, in these instances, local advisory committees which have certain designated functions related to the operation of the colleges. In these states the state board of community colleges is both an operating board and a coordinating board; but it delegates, either by law or by its own action, some responsibilities for the day-to-day operation of the institutions. It differentiates between overall coordination and policy-making and the operational decisions. In other words, its responsibilities are to control the operation of the institutions with the help of the local board. Specific authority may be assigned to these local boards, such as the employment of faculty, recommending selection of a president to the state board, and similar items. The extent to which the local boards actually operate these institutions at the local level varies considerably.

The third type of board used for community colleges (at the state level) is called a **coordinating board.** It has some of the responsibilities that the governing board has, but not the responsibilities over individual institutional operation. It becomes, in effect, a policy-making board which sets the limits within which the local boards operate. In these instances the coordinating board has control over general policy-making functions and some limited regulatory responsibilities. It may have authority over such areas as approval of new institutions, budgetary authority, accreditation of colleges, and a special responsibility for liaison with other state agencies.

There are 42 states which have some type of state-level organization in operation at this time; 23 of these states use the coordinating board as their way of organizing at the state level. In each of these 23 states the local board makes the operational day-to-day decisions, and the state board has the responsibility for coordination and policy-making decisions. In several of these states, particularly those that operate under the state board of education, there is a junior college advisory board which advises with the state board on matters relating to the community colleges.

While there are a number of areas which require state level attention, there are other areas which may be better handled at a local level. The difficulty is that we have no very clear guidelines to use in determining which area may be carried out best at which level. Included in principles of organizational structure, however, there are several guidelines which could be of specific use.

1. Coordination is a state-level responsibility. Even those states which have not had any agency at state-level have been forced to establish one, particularly as they develop more institutions. The evidence of success around the country seems to indicate clearly that coordination is accomplished best through leadership rather than through control. This is the important factor. Another important part of this concept is that a coordinated system should develop distinctiveness; it should not stifle creativity as a result of rules which push people from the top down, rather than setting a floor above which all colleges can build.

2. Where there is assignment of responsibility there must be authority to act. You must not expect anyone to be productive if you tell him to do something but do not give him the authority to do it. If the state board is given the responsibility for certain things, it must have the authority to act within those limits. If a local board is given a responsibility or if an institution is given a responsibility, they must be given authority to act. Otherwise they are not going to be effective.

3. Standardization does not result in equality or fairness. Standardization often equals educational mediocrity. Making rules which everyone must obey without any differentiation or without consideration of the ability to make decisions will not produce the best kind of program.

4. Methods used in achieving coordination are sometimes as important as the principle. It is important that the methods be consonant with the objective.

5. Unitary responsibility to a state-level agency is an important part of these principles. If you're going to carry out a program, you can't do it with effectiveness under a dual state-level responsibility.

In the operation of a good community-college program, the

state-level staff should be small. I have a desperate fear of bureaucracies. As I look around the nation, I note that the states which have the best junior college programs have the smallest statewide staffs. One conclusion reached by examining the evidence is that it is not necessary to have a large staff to achieve effective and efficient coordination. The most effective community college organizational structure as we observe it is one maintaining a relatively small staff but which draws heavily on the colleges for *ad hoc* jobs, using the facilities and the personnel of the colleges.

There should be a single line of responsibility for reporting. One of the difficulties we have observed in state after state is that those community colleges and other institutions that have to make reports to three or four agencies spend more time than they can afford just making reports.

Community colleges should use what we have learned about good management techniques, including a sound system of accountability. This can be accomplished only if there is adequate authority assigned to the state coordinating board for this purpose. Two or three states with which I am familiar have not been able to make much progress in developing a Management Information Service because the legislature has been unwilling to give the state coordinating borad the requisite authority to require management information.

If one uses these guiding principles and the procedures outlined above in examining the state *vis-a-vis* local relationships, he will undoubtedly reach some specific conclusions which affect the autonomy of institutions. As we have discussed the developing responsibilities of state level boards, we have noted that the activities of the staffs of these boards and the policies of these boards will undoubtedly affect the autonomy of individual institutions at least insofar as our more traditional viewpoint of autonomy is concerned. The extent to which it may enhance the work of the institutions is very much dependent, it would seem to me, upon:

1) The quality of personnel in the institution; 2) The quality and competence of state level personnel; 3) The sources of financial support; 4) The time boards will spend on important matters; and 5) The application of basic guidelines of operation.

The modification of the exclusively local orientation of community junior colleges requires that each institution relinquish some of its own decision-making responsibilities to the state board. This can only be done after rather careful consideration of the consequences. The autonomy of an institution is valid only if it produces a better education; it is not an end in itself.

The Private College in the 70's

Wesley M. Westerberg

A long-time administrator focuses on "life and death" issues that confront the private two-year colleges and on specific contributions toward meeting the issues.

For the presidents and trustees of private junior colleges, there is some bad news and some good news. Let's take the bad news first. You have the distinction of bearing responsibility for the life and death of the most beleaguered and threatened institution in higher education. Private junior colleges are closing their doors faster than any other type of institution. They are experiencing the greatest percentage of drop in enrollment. An article on college admissions for fall, 1971 concluded with the sentence: "Two-year private colleges experienced the most serious under-enrollment."* The article stated also that these colleges could have handled 26,000 more students than they enrolled.

Our kind of institution is the first to feel the effects of the competitive student market. The community college attracts by its low cost many who might otherwise enter [four-year institutions] as freshmen, and the four-year colleges and universities also lure away those who might otherwise stay as sophomores. Any way that the high school counselor, or the prospective student, or the public in general looks at us, we are the low man on the totem pole. When priorities are set by the governmental agencies in the allocation of resources, as recently in the direct aid program of the State of Illinois, we come under a different formula – one that is guaranteed to provide us with a

Wesley M. Westerberg is Chancellor of Kendall College, Evanston, Illinois. He is Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

**Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 17, 1972.

smaller piece of the pie, or, to be more realistic, the crumbs. The door to most foundations and corporations are closed (to us) because we do not represent the magic number of "four."

Well, I could go on, and you could recite some "bad news" of your own. Unfortunately, that is the only news some people in the private two-year sector are hearing; what is worse, they believe there is nothing else to hear, and they are giving up.

But there is good news to report. There are many private two-year colleges that are determined not to give up but to take a positive approach to their problems. Many of these have found a unique mission and are performing it.

Most of these have gained a reputation for providing a warm, human climate where the student does not have to feel he is being overwhelmed by size and impersonalization. Many are not ashamed to open their doors wide and to focus their attention on a segment of the student population who could not succeed at all but for the special attention and services that these colleges offer. Many are using their freedom from legislative red tape and controls to experiment with calendar, curriculum, and classroom. They are moving out of Old Main into the community and performing services that bring them close to the people. Some are consistently raising large sums of money to support these programs and are beginning to crack the corporations and foundations in their own areas – by persistent effort.

Over 100 of these colleges have banded together to improve the image and the operating strength of all the two-year colleges in the country through the National Council of Independent Junior Colleges and have confirmed their intentions by raising a budget of $50,000 a year. Some, like Lees and Alice Lloyd in Appalachia and Bacone in Oklahoma, are getting significant federal grants for imaginative new programs related to their communities. Elsewhere, as in Illinois, they are working hand in hand with private four-year institutions to achieve legislation for state aid to private institutions.

Toynbee's premise is that civilizations died because they did not respond to the challenges of their day. If that is true of colleges, what some private two-year colleges are doing is good news: they are responding.

Just as there is "bad news, good news" about our colleges, there is "bad news, good news" about ourselves – trustees and presidents. The bad news is that we're bewildered like everybody else. The good news is that maybe for the first time we are coming together to find some new directions and to develop better awareness of our respective functions. It is not my purpose here to discuss the roles of trustees and presidents or their relationship to each other; that would be a much

larger topic and is, I presume, the purpose of this entire conference. I would like to focus instead on the "life-and-death" issues that confront the private two-year colleges and the specific contributions that we can make toward meeting them. I think I can contain what I have to say under three headings: **purpose, visibility**, and **management**.

1. The private two-year college must have a clear purpose, clearly purpose, clearly conceived and stated, and fiercely believed.

The trustees, in the final analysis, must determine the goals of the college. The students, faculty, staff, and president will all share the process of determining goals, but the trustees also must be involved and become the final arbiters of the direction the college will take. Today this is more crucial than ever, for the kind of institution we represent must, of all institutions, develop a *unique* purpose if it is to survive. It is not enough for the college to want to be a private two-year college or even a good private two-year college which looks just like the bottom half of a four-year college. There are not going to be enough students interested in that when the woods are full of good community colleges and good four-year colleges, both public and private. Your institution must have a special function apart from all these. Maybe a function is to serve a special clientele in a special area (in that respect some church-related colleges with strong support in both admissions and contributions have it made – for a while, at least). Maybe you have to find that clientele in new groups of students you have never thought of serving before: adults who want to return to some formerly neglected opportunities; disadvantaged minorities; drop-outs or stop-outs of all kinds who are shy of the larger and less personal institutions; career groups whose needs can be met within the framework of your purposes and means.

The most logical purpose for your institution is for it to offer a different kind of education for the student who so far has not been very successful in our educational system. Call it an alternative or "second-chance" opportunity; it may be the first opportunity many of your students have had to get into a humane environment and to experience an individualized approach to learning.

Your college is better able to offer that experience than any other type of institution, but you must want to do it for the kinds of students who need it, and you must have the imagination and the dedication to implement it. Even after you decide on such a purpose you may find that half of your faculty will go right on teaching as though they were in a four-year college – and wishing they were. But that's another problem and one that the president and the dean – not the trustees – will have to handle. Make sure, only, that there is not

such a division among the trustees, and work towards total commitment of all segments of your college community to your goals.

2. Once your purpose is stated and accepted, use your particular skills to give it visibility.

As trustees, you represent the public and you are the college's liaison with the community. In that role, one of the gravest problems you face is the poor image of the private two-year college. This college is not understood, and the reason it is not known is that its story has never really been told. There is a great diversity – a glorious diversity – among these institutions; they adapt quickly to new situations. They are therefore difficult to describe as a whole, and this makes the job of stating the case one that we need to do together rather than separately. The latter is the task of the National Council of Independent Junior Colleges. Meanwhile, trustees of local institutions must literally open doors, through all of the relationships and connections they possess, to community groups, churches, corporations, foundations, and legislative bodies where opinions are formed and decisions are made.

I am talking now about one of the most untapped resources on trustee boards: their access to other people who can make a lot of difference in what they say in the right place at the right time. And it *is* time that we all speak up for equal treatment on a proportionate scale for our segment of higher education.

3. The trustees and the presidents must work together to assure good management.

It is one thing for us to say that management is the role of the administration and ultimately of the trustees and that teaching and advising are roles of the faculty. Faculty would like to manage, too, or so they think. But it is another thing when trustees and administrators do a bad job with the result that the teaching role and faculty morale are seriously affected by cut-backs in staff, supplies, and special programs. I am not suggesting that trustees get into the management of the institution any more than that the faculty get into it. But the trustee's ultimate responsibility for management is inescapable, and they will know it if the day of foreclosure ever comes.

Trustees and presidents together need to ask the questions: Does the college understand good management? And if not, what assistance can the trustees provide in the way of counsel, training, and systems of accountability? What does the audit really tell us about the soundness of our institutions? Does the auditor provide us with a management letter telling us what procedures, which we now seem to ignore, ought to be followed in the business office? Can we forecast what is going to happen to us five years from now? Are we getting reports at board meetings

that tell us where we are? I raise these questions because I know from experience how easily a college can be in trouble without the trustees being aware of it—and in some cases even the president.

In the future, again without getting involved in the administration of the college, trustees will need to work more closely with the president in applying to education principles which they know from the business world. What about quality controls, for example? Do we know what is happening to our graduates as a result of their experience in our classrooms? What about cost control? What are we doing in these times to offer the same or better services for less money? What marketing principles are applied to admissions, the design of special programs, evening courses, and other services? What about the organization of the college, including the board of trustees. to enable the college to govern itself effectively and to achieve its goals?

As I become acquainted with individual private two-year institutions, I am impressed with the dedication of the faculty and staff. Their concern for the student knows no limits and they are imaginative in their attempts to initiate change. What our colleges lack and what we are unable to afford on the marketplace, it seems, are special skills that would enable us to move ahead more dramatically. I am thinking especially of institutional research, which can tell us how well we are doing with our students and what more we ought to be doing; of long-range planning, which helps us to anticipate change; of thoroughgoing curricular reform; of the art of proposal writing and of other development skills; and of the ever-crucial organization for student recruitment.

Trustees have a special responsibility here, either by providing their own expertise in any of these areas or helping the president enlist help from others who can contribute counsel. Perhaps trustees can even encourage presidents to begin to include such skills in their budgets and guarantee support for them.

It was Henry T. Mudd, chairman of the board of Harvey Mudd College in Claremont, who said about a year ago: "Perhaps the colleges in the seventies will owe their success or failure to trustees who genuinely feel responsible and accountable, and who will, with a sense of exciting risk-taking, reexamine the whole process of higher education."

What Others Said

At the general dinner session, **Joseph P. Cosand** observed that the conference brought representatives together from both the private and public sectors. Emphasizing that we must avoid separatism and recognize that each individual institution functions within a total higher education community, Dr. Cosand also discussed the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education report, *The Open Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges* (June 1970), as they affect the future of the two-year college.

Robert L. Stuhr presented ten steps in building "an institutional blueprint" and ten "trends in development" in the seventies. Suggesting that a five-year plan seems to be optimum because of rapidly changing times, he placed particular emphasis on the trustees' role of asking the right questions at the right moment and the desirability of continual review and updating of specific objectives. Among suggestions for increasing philanthropic gifts was that of interpreting to potential donors the fact that their gifts will contribute to specific educational and institutional purposes rather than to reduction or elimination of a deficit. Noting an apparent trend toward establishing various "citizen boards," Mr. Stuhr urged that these boards be considered in order to "provide excellent training grounds for future trustees, valuable contact with new sources of support, and interchange with leaders capable of helping the college in many, many ways."

"Some 365 private four-year institutions will go out of business in the next decade unless new substantial sources of funding are found," reported **Frederic W. Ness** from a recent study conducted by the Association of American Colleges. Allowing his audience at the closing session to draw its own analogy, Dr. Ness discussed some of the changes the independent four-year colleges would have to accomplish if they are to

survive. He urged his audience to face up to the indictment of the "Newman Report" that higher education has largely failed to pull itself out of the Dark Ages. "We must engage in genuine reform and this is not a task to be left just to the four-year colleges and universities," Dr. Ness observed. The trustees and presidents of the two-year colleges are not only a part of the system, they are an extremely crucial part, he said. He expressed the opinion that few would disagree with his observation that the junior and community college is not understood by the public at large, despite its emergence on the present scale of educational priorities. In response to the question posed in the title of his remarks, "Who's Junior Now?" Dr. Ness concluded:

"Although I represent here today the baccalureate institutions, you are our juniors in name only. The task of convincing a generally disenchanted and unsophisticated citizenery that higher education deserves the topmost priority and that the loss of the independent sector and/or the weakening of the public sector would be both irrevocable and disastrous falls equally on us all. Through our joint efforts I am optimistic that we can and will and must succeed."

Selected Bibliography on Governance of the Two-Year College

(References to materials completed since 1967)

Blackmon, John H., *Trustee Responsibilities for Community Colleges and Technical Institutes of the North Carolina Community College System* (a manual). Raleigh, N.C.: North Carolina State Board of Education, 1970, 47 pp. (ED 047 685)

Bunnell, Kevin P., and Vadala, Julia (eds.). *Effective State Board Leadership in Community College Development* (papers of a workshop, San Francisco, September 26-27, 1968). Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, February, 1969, 43 pp. (ED 030 419)

Carpenter, Don A., "The Role of Nontrustees in Selecting Presidents," *Junior College Journal*, 42:9, June/July, 1972, pp. 27-29.

Collins, Charles C., "A Redefined Board for a Redefined Community" (Junior College Leadership Program, University of California, Berkeley, January, 1969, 13 pp.) (ED 038 132). *Junior College Journal*, 41:6, March, 1971, pp. 100-106.

"Corning Community College By-laws of the Board of Trustees." Corning, N.Y.: Corning Community College, January, 1967. (ED 024 366)

Davis, Esther R., "Elect the Board from the Community," *Junior College Journal*, 42:7, April, 1972, pp. 21-23.

Deegan, William L., "Student Government and Student Participation in Junior College Governance–Models for the 1970's." Sacramento, Calif.: California Junior College Association, January 19, 1970, 24 pp. (ED 047 662). *Junior College Journal*, 41:3, November, 1970, pp. 15-22.

_____, "Students and Governance: Where Are We? Where Are We Going?" *Junior College Journal*, 42:5, February, 1972, pp. 38-50.

Erickson, Clifford G., "To the New Junior College Trustee," *Junior College Journal*, 39:6, March, 1969, pp. 42-45.

Gilliland, J. Richard, and Nunnery, Michael Y., "Florida Trustees: Characteristics and Opinions," *Junior College Journal*, 40:5, February, 1970, pp. 25-29.

Hahn, Thomas C., "The Local Governing Board: Asset or Liability?" seminar paper, December, 1968, 21 pp. (ED 031 219)

Hatfield, Carol, "No More Rubber Stamp Board," *Junior College Journal*, 41:5, February, 1971, pp. 26-27.

Herridge, Eileen (ed.), *Board-President Relationships* (papers from a series of conferences for community college presidents and boards of trustees). Ann Arbor, Mich.: Midwest Community College Leadership Council, 1967, 94 pp. (ED 024 365)

Hickman, Marmette and Lieske, Gustave R., "The Current Status of Community College Organization, Control, and Support," July, 1969, 26 pp. (ED 032 041)

Ikenberry, Stanley O., "Governance and the Faculty," *Junior College Journal*, 42:3, November, 1971, pp. 12-15.

Johnson, B. Lamar (ed.), "The Junior College Board of Trustees." Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, 1971. Occasional report #16, Junior College Leadership Program. 66 pp.

Litton, Maurice T., and Buchanan, Ernest T., III, "The One Man–One Vote Rule and Selection of Trustees," *Junior College Journal*, 42:6, March, 1972, pp. 14-15.

Nichols, Suzanne, "Model for Participatory Governance for Community Colleges," 1971, 11 pp. (ED 054 772)

Riess, Louis C., "Institutional Attitudes Relating to Faculty Participation in the Governance of Higher Education: A Bibliography," November, 1970, 14 pp. (ED 043 330)

Rodda, George, Jr., "Trustee Power: Bridging Educational Gaps," *Junior College Journal*, 40:6, March, 1970, pp. 39-40.

_____, and Mensel, R. Frank, "Trustee Power: Behind the Scenes Key to Community College Funds," *College and University Business*, August, 1970, pp. 16-24.

Singer, Donald L., and Grande, John A., "Emerging Patterns of Governance: Promise or Peril?" *Junior College Journal*, 41:6, March, 1971, pp. 38-42.

Sykes, Abel B., Jr., "Junior College Boards of Trustees," *Junior College Research Review*, 4:10, June, 1970, 4 pp. (ED 038 978)

Unpublished Dissertations (since 1966)

Ebbesen, James Andrew. "Junior College Board Members: Their Personal Characteristics and Attitudes Toward Junior College Functions, State of Illinois, 1968-69." Northern Illinois University, June, 1969. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, #69-19892.

Fox, Gary Chalmers. "The Need of In-Service Education for Community College Trustees as Perceived by Presidents and Trustees of Community Colleges." Michigan State University, 1966. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, #67-1625.

Mills, Peter K. "The Community College Board of Trustees and the Process of Institutional Change." Rutgers University, 1972 (to be available from University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Mich.)

Murphy, James. "Policy Boards of Local Public Institutions of Higher Education." Indiana University, 1968. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, #69-4791.

Sapper, Charles Kenneth. "Selected Social, Economic, and Attitudinal Characteristics of the Trustees of California's Public Junior Colleges." University of California, Berkeley, 1966. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, #66-15319. (ED 027 876)

Note: Documents with ED code numbers may be purchased in microfiche (MF–$.65) or hard/photocopy (HC–$3.29 per 100 pp.). Order in writing from ERIC (Educational Research Information Center) Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Drawer O, Bethesda, Md. 20014. Advance payment required for orders under $10.00.

Order dissertations, by identification number, from University Microfilms, 300 N. Zeeb Rd., Ann Arbor, Mich. 48106; $4.00 for microfilm, $10.00 for Xeroxing.

Community College Trustees: A Survey

Peter K. Mills

Created for the most part by joint action of the state and local community, the relatively new community college purports to provide comprehensive, low-cost, non-resident post-secondary education to anyone who can profit from it. It is a unique institution with a unique mission and its function in the educational system varies with the several states. In some areas, the board of control may be the local county or municipal school board. Other states have organized community colleges as an integral part of an affiliated higher education system; the colleges are locally sponsored with state support and an independent board of trustees is elected or appointed. Still another approach is the "state system" where one statewide coordinating board functions for all community colleges and local "advisory" boards may or may not be established. Methods of sponsorship vary from state to state (and within states) as does the proportion and amount of state aid.

The question "Who controls our community colleges?" is difficult to answer. Despite differences in state organizations or in legislative support, however, one common thread runs through all systems. At some point, whether the colleges are local, regional or statewide, a group of laymen is designated as a board of control, board of directors, board of regents or board of trustees.

The Survey

Until Morton A. Rauh in collaboration with Rodney T. Hartnett conducted his study in 1969,[1] little

Peter K. Mills is Dean of Institutional Advancement at Delaware County Community College (Penna.). His paper is based on a doctoral dissertation, "Community College Trustees and the Process of Institutional Change," Rutgers University, 1972. His survey was supported, in part, by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges and was conducted with the cooperation of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

[1]Morton A. Rauh, *The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities,* McGraw-Hill, 1969; Rodney T. Hartnett, *College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds, Roles, and Educational Attitudes,* Educational Testing Service, 1969.

was known about the laymen of higher education: Who are they? What are their backgrounds and characteristics? Where do they stand on basic educational issues? and the like. Because their study touched on only nine percent of the two-year college boards in operation in 1968 as part of their sampling of all sectors of the academy, comprehensive follow-up directed specifically at just the public community college boards was considered to be both a necessary and helpful addition to the sparse literature in this particular sector. Using a different sampling strategy, this study focused on those institutions which were directly governed by local boards of trustees and also surveyed the presidents of these colleges on matters affecting internal participation and change in governance.

A group of 455 public two-year colleges *which had local governing boards* was established as the institutional population. A two-part questionnaire was designed: one part intended for presidents and the other for trustees. Presidents of these institutions were surveyed and trustee names and addresses requested; 296 presidents (52.5 percent) responded to the questionnaire during the spring, 1971. Lists of trustee names and addresses were secured for well over 90 percent of the institutions responding. A sample was created of approximately one-third of the trustees on each institutional mailing list. The second questionnaire was directed to them during the fall of 1971; 296 trustees (55.8 percent) responded.

Characteristics of Institutions and Boards

Community college boards are smaller than college and university boards in general. The majority of boards had between seven and nine members, with the most frequent size being seven. Sixty percent of the trustees were elected, the remainder appointed. There generally was no limitation on the number of terms a trustee may serve. Respondents noted that boards almost universally took action at open, public meetings and did not normally meet in prior restricted sessions to decide issues. Meeting agendas were widely distributed to the administration, faculty leaders and the press; less widely to student leaders.

Since community college boards tend to be small, it follows that most operate as a committee of the whole. Where there are committees, those for finance and facilities are most frequent (Table 1). Those boards which do operate in committees do not generally invite regular participation in discussions by anyone other than the president; in one-quarter of the cases, the president is not a participant either. Faculty and student participation in trustee committee deliberations occurs at very few of the institutions which have trustee committees. Alumni and the general public are almost never involved.

At only 15 percent of the colleges does anyone other than the president report directly to the board. The board maintains its own office on campus at three percent of the

institutions. The public and campus press were used to communicate trustee decisions to faculty and students. Policy manuals were available at most institutions and were regularly distributed to staff. Fewer than half of the colleges gave manuals to student leaders.

Institutional Governance – Participation in the Change Process

Eighty percent of the colleges reported that they had some kind of vehicle to effect change in institutional government. A majority said this structure was new or revised within the past two years. Administrators and faculty were universally represented, with students represented to a lesser degree. Fewer than half of the colleges involved the non-professional staff in their change mechanisms. While the functioning of this change process was routinely explained in writing, few institutions made special efforts to publicize how the system worked. Little formal or informal contact was reported between trustees and any members of the college community other than administration.

Trustee Characteristics, Attitudes and Activities

Personal Background. The typical community college trustee was: a Caucasian male; the holder of a bachelor's degree; a Protestant over 45; an executive, lawyer, doctor or small businessman (Table 2) who earns more than $20,000 a year; married with children; a long-time community resident; a Republican who describes himself as a moderate, and who has served as a trustee for more than five years and has other extensive public service.

Reading Habits. Trustees read little of literature of higher education and are only familiar with those titles which have been summarized or widely reported in the popular press. Furthermore, their periodical readership is practically limited to *The Readers' Digest* and the national picture and news weeklies.

Attitudes Toward Community Colleges in Higher Education. Community college trustees appeared to understand and strongly support the concepts of universal higher education and the "open door" admissions policy for community colleges. They agreed that these colleges should, in general, be comprehensive institutions. Trustees supported the principles of academic freedom and strongly expressed the conviction that their institutions should serve as a community cultural center. They stated overwhelmingly that teaching effectiveness, not research or publications, should be the prime concern of faculty. They seemed less convinced that the institution should be actively engaged in solving community social problems. Trustees encouraged innovation in instruction and more flexibility in the curriculum to meet individual needs. However, they were not sure that they wanted to disturb the traditional grading system. (See Table 3.)

Attitudes on Governance. Trustees believed that public two-year

colleges should be governed as a part of a state system of higher education rather than to be connected to the public schools. They felt that the appropriate model for community colleges should be the lay governing board elected or appointed at the local level. Trustees offered widely divergent opinions on the question of whether the composition of governing boards generally is "representative" of the communities they serve; most trustees, however, considered their own board to be representative. Most trustees agreed that the membership of governing boards should be broadened, but did not feel that the way should be cleared to permit faculty members and students to serve. Nevertheless they supported increased trustee involvement with student and faculty, as long as the role of the president was not undermined. A majority of trustees expressed belief in increased participation by students and faculty in policy development, but opposed collective bargaining with the faculty.

Again, there were wide disagreements among trustees about whether they have been too aloof from other (non-administrative) members of the college community. On the other hand, most did not feel that the president should serve as the only channel of communication. (See Table 4.)

Political Attitudes. Trustees generally identified with the views of Richard Nixon, Spiro Agnew, Ronald Reagan and Nelson Rockefeller. They expressed very negative feelings toward the views of George Wallace, Jerry Rubin and Eldridge Cleaver. The trustees tended to identify more with Republicans and conservatives and to reject the views of radicals on the right or left.

The President as Educational Leader. Trustees overwhelmingly agreed with a definition of educational leader as change agent, but twenty percent fewer of them felt that educational leadership was an accepted function of the two-year college presidency. They strongly agreed that it should be so. In supporting the concept of president as educational leader, trustees stated that they were willing to support the president's delegation of fiscal management to another administrator, and to encourage experimentation and tolerate occasional failure. They further agreed that budget and facility requests should be related to improved learning and that they should hold the president accountable for establishing participation in recommending and evaluating educational change. They felt strongly that college facilities and administrative organization should be designed to enhance good human relations and that institutions should be more accountable for what they produce. Trustees generally accepted the fact that their role and the president's role may have to be modified to accommodate some of these desireable changes.

Trustee Activities. More than half of the trustees reported spending 11

hours per month on trustee activities. Twenty percent devoted more than 21 hours. Trustees tended to allocate more of their time to matters of finance and facilities and gave least attention to student life. Slightly more than 30 percent of the trustees reported that they had been significantly involved in what several writers have regarded as a major trustee function: "determining or reassessing institutional purpose." Only 17 percent of the trustees responded that they were involved with their board in "protecting the institution" from unwarranted attacks from within or without.[2] Eighty-one trustees (27.4 percent) reported that their board had served as a "court of last resort" to resolve personnel grievances which could not be redressed through administrative channels.

Conclusions

Community college governance practices are very similar to those at four-year colleges and universities, despite important differences in purposes, type of students and institutional size. There is no community participation in governance, and "communications gap" exists between boards and those governed. More positively, it seems clear that trustees indicated an understanding of the unique purposes of the community college. They desired increased participation by staff and students and were willing to have more personal contact with them. There was a commitment to innovation and the president's role as "educational leaders." Board size appears appropriate and the functioning of boards seems efficient and is conducted in the open. There is an apparent willingness of trustees to accommodate themselves to change and a modification of their roles.

Some Further Observations and Suggestions

In light of the findings reported here it seems appropriate that some further interpretation be made with a view toward offering some suggestions for increasing both the efficiency and effectiveness of boards of trustees.

Representativeness

- Boards, nominating committees and appointing authorities should give increased concern to broadening the membership of boards of trustees so that it more accurately reflects the community at large.
- Some way should be found for faculty and student representatives to "sit on" or "meet with" boards of trustees without violating the conflict of interest principle.
- Young community college alumni, particularly those who

[2]Community colleges did not experience much confrontation during the period of September 1969 - June 1971. Only 34 colleges (14.2 percent) reported such incidents. Trustees were generally uninformed about the Scranton Commission's recommendations regarding campus violence, but felt that modes of protest should be defined as legitimate or illegitimate and firm action taken against the latter.

had been active on campus while in attendance, should be recruited for trustee service. It goes without saying that women and minority groups should play a larger role.

- Given the fact that 15 percent of trustees are over 65 years of age and only five percent are under 35, and that most boards do not limit the number of terms, it seems reasonable that age and term limitations be considered. These changes could help to clear the way for improved representativeness.

Involvement

- More informal contact and communication among all members of the college community should be encouraged.
- Students and non-professional staff need to be involved more meaningfully, in areas that are of concern to them, and an open atmosphere should be promoted which permits concerns to be raised in non-threatening ways.
- Sincere and imaginative efforts are needed to educate faculty and students to how the "system" functions and how to make it work for them.
- It seems justified to suggest that decisions reached at trustee meetings be more rapidly communicated to the college community.

Trustee Role

- Trustees are busy public citizens. Whatever changes occur in the trustee role, the time to accomplish the new functions will have to come from reordering present activities, not from additional commitments of time. The emphasis should be placed on broad institutional concerns, not just facilities and finance.
- Consideration should be given to the formation of "Long Range Goals" task forces or committees, to be composed of trustees, students, faculty and staff. This for two reasons: the healthy interaction of participants; and the need for most institutions to reassess purpose, direction and emphasis.
- Presidents, more than any other individual or group, are responsible for significant changes or improvements in the governance structure, communication levels and the degree of attention given to institutional purposes.

Need for Further Research

- A study of the basic assumptions underlying the concept of the "control of American higher education by governing boards composed of unpaid laymen" is needed. In addition to increasing pressures from faculty and students, there is mounting political interest in the control and financing of education at all levels. A study along this line may dispel some of the myths about the separation of education and politics and may recommend new models of governance.

TABLE 1

COMMITTEES ESTABLISHED BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARDS*

Name	Yes	No
	%	%
Facilities (Bldgs. & Grounds)	40	58
Finance	36	62
Personnel	29	69
Executive	27	70
Budget	23	74
Education (Curriculum)	21	77
Planning	16	82
Policy	15	82
Legislation	13	84
Development	12	85
Community Relations	10	87
Student Life	8	90
Other	40	52

*No response varied between 0 and 5.4 percent. All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF TRUSTEE OCCUPATIONS*

Occupations	Chairmen	Other Members	Total
	%	%	%
Managerial Executive (Bus./Indus.)	25	24	25
Legal Profession	17	9	12
Proprietor, Small Business	10	8	9
Health Professions	12	7	8
Ed. Administration	4	9	7
Housewife	6	8	7
Agriculture	6	5	5
Sales	3	5	4
Accounting	4	4	4
Managerial Executive (Govt./Public Adm.)	2	5	4
Faculty Member at Institution	–	5	3
Engineering	4	2	3
Scientist	3	2	2
Communications/News Media	2	2	2
Clergy	–	1	1
Arts	–	1	–
Labor Official	–	1	–
No Response	4	4	4

*All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

TABLE 3

TRUSTEE ATTITUDES:
AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION AND TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Statements (abbreviated)	Extent of Agreement*		
	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Can't Say %
Local two-year college should be extension of public school system rather than part of state system of higher education.	2	4	4
It is appropriate for public two-year colleges to have a lay governing board elected or appointed on the local level.	46	50	1
Recent charge that boards lack "representative" membership of youth, women, minorities and certain occupations is generally true.	5	33	19
Board on which I serve is quite representative of our community.	22	50	2
Board members have kept too aloof from staff, faculty and students. Communication and contact should be increased.	6	39	12
President should be only channel of communication between trustees and individuals in community.	5	16	3
Principles of academic freedom which apply to the four-year college and university should hold for community college.	21	46	11
Institution should actively engage in solving community social problems.	14	44	14
Teaching effectiveness, not research or publication, should be primary criterion for employing and promoting faculty.	52	42	1
Collective bargaining by faculty not appropriate mechanism for two-year college.	20	31	18
Students involved in illegal acts off campus should be punished by college authorities as well as civil authorities.	11	17	16

*Percentages in the "disagree," "strongly- disagree," and "no response" categories are not portrayed due to space limitations. All percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

TABLE 4

TRUSTEE ATTITUDES: PROPOSED CHANGES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Proposals (abbreviated)	Extent of Agreement*		
	Strongly Agree %	Agree %	Can't Say %
Membership of governing boards should be more representative of the community.	13	45	12
Regulations prohibiting a student or faculty member from serving on board should be changed.	4	24	7
With consideration for the role of the president, increased trustee involvement with students and faculty advisable in joint committees, problem-solving task forces, social affairs, etc.	15	59	4
Governance structures should be developed to permit wider participation in policy development by student and faculty representatives and individuals.	8	60	7

*Percentages in the "disagree," "strongly disagree," and "no response" categories are not portrayed due to space limitations. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

Commentary

S. V. Martorana

A note of interest at the outset in reacting to Peter K. Mills' useful and current report on community college trustees is that knowledge about college trustees seems to grow very slowly indeed. When research activity here is compared with some other topics as, for example, faculty negotiations, the growth rate of information on trustees is at a virtual snail's pace. In 1963 in *College Boards of Trustees,* I wrote:

> "In view of the deep public trust placed in persons who serve on boards of trustees, one would expect that they as persons and as groups would be the subject of many scholarly studies. Contrary to this expectation, relatively few definitive studies of characteristics of boards of trustees are to be found in the published writings on higher education. This remains an area in which research is yet in the pioneering stage, despite the fact that colleges and universities have been operating for over three hundred years."

Mills' study of community college trustees and the broader one by Rauh and Hartnett of trustees of all types of higher educational institutions (on which departure Mills builds his investigation) serve as moves out of the pioneering stage of research on the college trusteeship in America. They document

–S. V. Martorana, Professor of Higher Education and Research Associate, Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University.

clearly, however, that much more analytical inquiry remains and needs to be done.

This is true particularly with respect to the community and junior colleges because these institutions generally accept a special commitment to serve a more localized area and a more popularly representative constituency than most other types of higher educational institutions do. These institutions, therefore, as Mills' research discloses, typically have smaller boards of trustees which, moreover, are statutorily structured and operationally geared to assure that the word "community" in the name "community college" will remain a meaningful designation. The fact that 60 percent of the community college trustees were found to be elected to office rather than appointed is one reflection of this intent and design to build "local responsiveness" into the key policy formation level of these institutions.

Mills' report brings out other findings in his "snapshot" of today's community college trustee which, with his conclusions and suggested further research, comprise an altogether helpful document for both trustees and presidents. He points out, for example, that the distribution of trustees by age is disbalanced toward the older ages and, further, that this fact, coupled with the general practice of placing no limit on terms served, raises serious question about board effectiveness. Similarly, he suggests that studies beyond his own are needed to pursue further the implications of such observations as, for example, the very limited sources of information trustees typically depend upon beyond the reports they receive from their chief employee, the college president. And he cogently discloses that boards show a preoccupation with issues of finance and governance to the detriment of considerations of institutional goals, curriculum, and instruction.

It is a recognized fact, albeit difficult to accept, that the first step toward improvement is a clear and objective analysis of the current condition. Mills tells the members of community college boards of trustees how they currently look characteristically, and how they now behave, typically. His work in gathering and interpreting these facts, together with identifying implications for improvement of current practices and for more penetrating investigative studies, give good examples for other researchers to follow. Admittedly, the current report raises more questions than it provides answers to questions about board services and the future needs of boards. Only by reading Mills' work and analysis carefully, however, and considering seriously the outcomes of continued, even larger and deeper research, will better answers be found. In this effort, the Association of Governing Boards has already rendered a notable service. It is an effort whose merit should be recognized by all community college boards of trustees as well as by those of other types of colleges to which scholars, administrators, and laymen should pledge their full support.

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges is the only organization within higher education concerned primarily with the problems and responsibilities of trustees serving all types of colleges and universities. Existing to strengthen higher education by strengthening its lay leadership, AGB works to maintain sound relationships between trustees and the president, the faculty, and the student body.

AGB currently serves more than 500 member boards representing more than 800 colleges and universities and approximately 11,000 trsutees and regents. The Association works toward its objectives through publications, conferences, and seminars, and special studies on matters of unique interest to the voluntary, lay board member. Membership is open to boards of two-year and four-year colleges, universities, foundations and other organizations within higher education which hold tax-exempt status.

ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNING BOARDS OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036